

NIOC 7772
PATENTREMARKS

Applicant has thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the Office action of November 16, 2005 and has amended the claims to more clearly set forth the invention. Inasmuch as Amendment B was not entered, this Amendment C incorporates the subject matter of Amendment A, presents the amendments of Amendment B, and presents additional claims for consideration.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toporek (US 6,584,083) in view of Haldeman (US 6,801,576). By this Amendment C, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 have been amended and claims 8-20 have been added. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-20 in light of the amendments and following remarks.

As previously discussed, Toporek merely discloses a method of incorporating satellite connections into the TCP/IP environment of the Internet. The method intercepts a TCP/IP format communication from a client to a server, converts the communication to a new format (i.e., XTP), transmits it over the satellite link to a location closer to the server, and converts the communication back into a TCP/IP format to be transmitted through the Internet to the server. It is basically a seamless integration of satellite transmissions into the Internet in order to improve the speed with which the Internet transmits data over long distances using current technology (see Toporek at Col. 3, Lines 43-55). The Examiner notes that Toporek does not teach live media webcasting (see Office Action at page 4). As explained below, Toporek also fails to teach a portable webcasting system as recited in Applicant's

NIOC 7772
PATENT

claims. Applicant submits that the teachings of Haldeman fail to cure these deficiencies.

Toporek contemplates a fixed first location such that the satellite communications system of Toporek is not portable. Toporek provides for integrating Internet services into conventional satellite systems (see Toporek at Col. 3, Lines 43-58, FIG. 1). The conventional satellite systems disclosed by Toporek all used large, fixed dish communications systems which defeats portability as claimed by the present invention.

Moreover, Toporek fails to address a solution to the lengthy and complicated procedures required to install a satellite uplink, which also defeats portability. For example, antenna peaking and pointing is a complicated process often performed by an installation professional. Toporek fails to address the complicated process of antenna peaking and pointing because it assumes the use of a permanent, large, fixed dish that is professionally installed, not the **portable** system of the present invention. Automation of this process is desirable to produce a portable webcasting system.

In contrast to the cited references, the present invention teaches automated set up of a live media webcasting system at a new first location (see Application at paragraphs [0068] to [0074] and [0078] to [0083]). To this end, claim 1 as amended recites, "A **portable** satellite uplink for use in connection with a **portable** webcasting system for capturing live media content at a first location and webcasting the live media content to a second location...". Claim 4 as amended recites, "A **portable**

NIOC 7772
PATENT

webcasting system ... comprising ... a **portable** uplink router at the first location...".

Applicant submits that Haldeman also fails to recognize portable live media webcasting as claimed by the present invention and, thus, fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference. Conventional wisdom in the industry held that it was not possible to send digital video over a satellite link due to a limited bitrate. The only way to send video by satellite was in analog form. However, one skilled in the art will recognize that analog video requires an entire satellite transponder at a cost of approximately \$5000 per day. Webcasting as defined in the present invention costs substantially less (e.g., less than \$500 per day for the satellite transponder bandwidth). To this end, claim 1 as amended recites, "... converting the live media content received in the second digital webcast format to a satellite transmission signal ... and transmitting the satellite transmission signal to the satellite over the satellite communication link...". Claim 4 as amended recites, "... converting the first digital webcast signal to a second digital webcast signal ... converting the second digital webcast signal into a satellite transmission signal; and transmitting the satellite transmission signal to the satellite ...". Claim 6 as amended recites, "... converting the first digital webcast signal to a second digital webcast signal being insensitive to the transmission propagation delay of the satellite communication link; converting the second digital webcast signal into a satellite transmission signal; transmitting the satellite transmission signal from the first location to the communication satellite...". Thus,

NIOC 7772
PATENT

Haldeman fails to disclose live media webcasting as claimed by the present invention.

Additionally, webcasting, which is mentioned only once in Haldeman (see Haldeman at Col. 3, Line 39), is limited to a studio or other place with a sufficient terrestrial Internet connection (see Haldeman, remote webcast 173, at FIG. 1). Haldeman does not contemplate live media webcasting from a location remote from a terrestrial Internet connection. Further, Haldeman is merely concerned with distributing video from a load balanced server arrangement to a particular end user. The end user may receive the video via analog satellite transmission (see Haldeman at Col. 4, Lines 24-29) or by the Internet (see Haldeman at Col. 6, Lines 24-45). Haldeman is not concerned with how its system receives video; only that it does. Haldeman does not acknowledge any problem with the way in which it receives video content, or any need to expand the ways in which it receives content. Thus, Haldeman does not suggest any limitations or problems with transmitting video from a remote location to its system which are in need of a remedy, and there is no suggestion to combine the cited references.

Furthermore, both Toporek and Haldeman are directed to connecting Internet users to content available on the Internet (i.e., to enhancing the end user experience by connecting users to available content). Thus, if the system of Toporek was combined with the system of Haldeman, the resulting system would address the back end of webcasting (i.e., providing a webcast from a server to an end user). The combination of the two systems provides a TCP/IP connection of the end user's LAN to the servers of

NIOC 7772
PATENT'

Haldeman despite a large geographical separation. The result would be to yield a more efficient way of sending video from the servers of Haldeman to an end user such as a company or college requesting large amounts of video and having an internal high performance local area network (LAN).

However, there is no suggestion to combine the two systems, particularly on the front end of webcasting (i.e., sending digital video content from a venue or first location to an Internet Service Provider (ISP) who provides the webcast to end users). Both of the cited references are directed to distributing existing content (i.e., connecting users to content available on the internet), not to making additional content (e.g., a live media webcast) available on the Internet. Thus, one skilled in the art would find no suggestion to combine these two references in such a way. In contrast to Toporek and Haldeman, Applicant's invention, as recited in amended claim 1, is directed to, "A portable satellite uplink for use in connection with a webcasting system for capturing live media content at a first location and webcasting the live media content to a second location...". Claim 4 as amended recites, "... a portable uplink router...", and claim 6 as amended recites, "... encoding said live media content at a first location ... [and] uplinking the encoded media content from the first location across the satellite communication link...".

Applicant further submits that Haldeman teaches away from a combination with Toporek because it assumes that all satellite transmissions should be analog. Haldeman makes this assumption because it is concerned with the quality of

NIOC 7772
PATENT

video provided to its end users (see Haldeman at Col. 2, Lines 3-28, and Col. 3, Line 47 - Col. 4, Line 28). Haldeman fails to address the possibility of sending digital video over a satellite communications link because conventional industry wisdom held that transferring high quality digital video over a transmission controlled protocol (TCP) satellite connection was impossible due to limited bitrate. Thus, Haldeman teaches away from the combination with the Toporek reference.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejections of claims based on these references, and/or provide some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in the prior art to select and combine the Toporek and Haldeman references.

Applicant submits that the cited references also fail to teach the subject matter of new claims 8-20, and that the new claims do not present new subject matter. New claims 8-9, 12-13, and 16-17 include subject matter directed to automated setup of the portable satellite uplink (see Application at paragraphs [0036] to [0061] and [0078] to [0082]). New claims 10-11, 14-15, and 18-19 include subject matter directed to a teleport system for coordinating multiple live webcasts and/or for improving the transmission signal of a particular portable webcast system (see Application at paragraphs [0033] to [0034]). New claim 20 includes subject matter directed to delivering a transmitted webcast from a satellite to users (see Application at paragraphs [0064] to [0067]).

NIOC 7772
PATENT

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 4, and 6 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 2-3, 5, and 7-20 depend from these claims and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-20 are allowable over the cited art and that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The fact that Applicant may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Examiner should not be construed as indicating Applicant's agreement therewith.

Applicant does not believe that a fee is due in connection with this response. If, however, the Commissioner determines that a fee is due, he is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Bain, Reg. No. 36,736
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

RMB/MAP/lav

via Facsimile (571) 273-8300